



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,603	11/21/2003	T. Shantha Raju	P1096RICI	3279
9157	7590	08/02/2006	EXAMINER	
GENENTECH, INC. 1 DNA WAY SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080			SCHWADRON, RONALD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/719,603	Applicant(s) RAJU, T. SHANTHA	
	Examiner Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-9,25-29 in the reply filed on 6/26/06 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 10-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/26/06.
3. Claims 1-9,25-29 are under consideration.
4. Applicant is required to update the status of all US applications disclosed in the instant application.
5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).
6. Claims 1-9,25-29 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9,20,35,37,39,41,43 of copending Application No. 10/744844. Although the conflicting

claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because while the two sets of claims differ in scope, both sets of claims encompass compositions/articles of manufacture that comprise the glycoproteins/antibodies/immunoadhesins with the properties recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Therefore the two sets of claims would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-5,25,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumpel et al.

Kumpel et al. teach human monoclonal antibodies wherein substantially all of the oligosaccharide found on said antibody is G2 (see Table 1, columns 1-3, and page 149, column 1, first incomplete paragraph). Said antibodies are in composition form wherein they are contained in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (eg. tissue culture media). The antibody 2B6 disclosed in Table 1 is an IgG1 antibody (see page 144, second column). The antibody is inherently in a container with a label because otherwise it could not be identified.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-9,25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumpel et al. in view of Maras et al. (US Patent 5,834,251) and prior art disclosed in the specification (page 2 and page 19, last paragraph, continued on next page).

Kumpel et al. teach human monoclonal antibodies wherein substantially all of the oligosaccharide found on said antibody is G2 (see Table 1, columns 1-3, and page 149, column 1, first incomplete paragraph). Said antibodies are in composition form wherein they are contained in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (eg. tissue culture media). The antibody 2B6 disclosed in Table 1 is an IgG1 antibody (see page 144, second column). Kumpel et al. teach that antibodies with substantially all G2 oligosaccharide have increased lysis of target cells in comparison to the same antibody which is produced in a manner that results in low levels of G2 (see Figure 3). Kumpel et al. do not teach the molecules of claims 6-9 or the articles of manufacture of claim 29. Maras et al. teach that B-1,4 Galactosyltransferase can be used to modify the oligosaccharide profile on a glycoprotein (see columns 12 and 16). Kumpel et al. teach that said enzyme is involved in the production of G2 oligosaccharides (see abstract). The prior art recited in the specification (pages 2 and 19) discloses that the antibodies, immunoadhesions and chimeric molecules recited in claims 6-9 were known in the art, as was the clinical use of said molecules. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have created G2 oligosaccharide versions of the art known molecules recited in claims 6-9 because Kumpel et al. teach that antibodies with substantially all G2 oligosaccharide have increased lysis of target cells in comparison to the same antibody which is produced in a manner that results in low levels of G2 and Maras et al. teach that B-1,4 Galactosyltransferase can be used to modify the oligosaccharide profile on a glycoprotein (eg. to produce G2 oligosaccharide glycoproteins). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do the aforementioned in order to produce G2 versions of the aforementioned glycoproteins for potential clinical evaluation. Said G2 glycoproteins would have been produced as the claimed articles of manufacture for use in clinical trials.


11. No claim is allowed.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644


RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800 1644